UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,379	07/09/2003	Skott C. Klebe	C0011/7004	1320

64967   7590   10/03/2006

LAW OFFICES OF PAUL E. KUDIRKA
40 BROAD STREET
SUITE 300
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
HA, LEYNNA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/616,379	KLEBE, SKOTT C.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LEYNNA T. HA	2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _06 December 2004_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _10/10/2003_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-30 have been examined and is pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   **Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipate**

by Romansky, et al. (US 6,535,871).

As per claim 1:

Romansky discloses a method for distributing secure digital content that

can be indexed by third party

search engines, the method comprising:

(a) generating a text stream from the digital content by stripping all graphic

information and punctuation from the digital content; **(col.2, line 5)**

(b) fragmenting the text stream into multi-word phrases; **(col.2, lines 11-**

32 and col.3, lines 6-17)

(c) randomly assembling the phrases into a scrambled document; and

(col.2, lines 33-40 and col.3, lines 24-35)

(d) making the scrambled document available to the third party search

engines. **(col.3, lines 43-52)**

As per claim 2:   See col.2, lines 11-32 and col.3, lines 6-17: discussing a

method of claim 1 wherein step (b) comprises parsing the text stream to

generate a word stream and fragmenting the word stream into phrases, where

each phrase contains at least two words.

As per claim 3:   See col.2, lines 26-40 and col.3, lines 24-35: discussing

the method of claim 2 wherein the total number of words in a phrase is

random.

As per claim 4:   See col.2, lines 11-35 and col.3, lines 6-17: discussing the

method of claim 3 wherein the total number of words in a phrase has a

maximum of five words.

As per claim 5:   See col.2, lines 26-40 and col.3, lines 24-35: discussing

the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) comprises forming a stream of phrases

and randomly swapping the position of phrases in the phrase stream.

As per claim 6:   See col.1, lines 60-65 and col.3, lines 47-52: discussing

the method of claim 1 further comprising: (e) returning the scrambled

document content when the scrambled document is indexed by the third party

search engines.

As per claim 7:   See col.3, lines 42-52 and col.4, lines 4-10: discussing a method of claim 6 wherein step (e) comprises examining a user agent parameter to determine whether a search engine or a browser is requesting the scrambled document.

As per claim 8:   See col.1, lines 19-24 and 59-65: discussing the method of claim 6 further comprising: (f) returning a link to an owner of the secure content when a browser links from the search engine to the indexed scrambled document.

As per claim 9:   See col.1, lines 19-24 and 36-65: discussing the method of claim 8 wherein the scrambled document contains a script routine that loads a web page provided by the secure content owner and step (f) comprises running the script routine after the scrambled document content has been loaded into the browser.

As per claim 10: See col.1, lines 46-48 and 60-65 and col.3, lines 43-52: discussing the method of claim 9 wherein step (f) comprises using the script routine to hide the scrambled text from a user.

As per claim 11:

Romansky discloses apparatus for distributing secure digital content that can be indexed by third party search engines, the apparatus comprising:

a stripper that generates a text stream from the digital content by stripping all graphic information and punctuation from the digital content;

(col.2, line 5)

means for fragmenting the text stream into multi-word phrases; **(col.2, lines 11-32 and col.3, lines 6-17)**

a stream assembler that randomly assembles the phrases into a scrambled document; and **(col.2, lines 33-40 and col.3, lines 24-34)**

means for making the scrambled document available to the third party search engines. **(col.3, lines 43-52)**

As per claim 12: See col.2, lines 11-35 and col.3, lines 6-17: discussing the apparatus of claim 11 wherein the means for fragmenting comprises a parser that parses the text stream to generate a word stream and a fragmenter that fragments the word stream into phrases, where each phrase contains at least two words.

As per claim 13: See col.2, lines 26-40 and col.3, lines 24-35: discussing the apparatus of claim 12 wherein the total number of words in a phrase is random.

As per claim 14: See col.2, lines 11-35 and col.3, lines 12-17: discussing the apparatus of claim 13 wherein the total number of words in a phrase has a maximum of five words.

As per claim 15: See col.2, lines 26-40 and col.3, lines 24-35: discussing the apparatus of claim 11 wherein the stream assembler comprises means for forming a stream of phrases and means for randomly swapping the position of phrases in the phrase stream.

As per claim 16: See col.1, lines 60-65 and col.3, lines 47-52: discussing the apparatus of claim 11 further comprising means for returning the scrambled document content when the scrambled document is indexed by the third party search engines.

As per claim 17: See col.3, lines 42-52 and col.4, lines 4-10: discussing the apparatus of claim 16 wherein the means for returning the scrambled document content comprises means for examining a user agent parameter to determine whether a search engine or a browser is requesting the scrambled document.

As per claim 18: See col.1, lines 19-24 and 59-65: discussing the apparatus of claim 16 further comprising means for returning a link to an owner of the secure content when a browser links from the search engine to the indexed scrambled document.

As per claim 19: See col.1, lines 19-24 and 36-65: discussing the apparatus of claim 18 wherein the scrambled document contains a script routine that loads a web page provided by the secure content owner and the means for returning a link to an owner of the secure content comprises means for running the script routine after the scrambled document content has been loaded into the browser.

As per claim 20: See col.1, lines 46-48 and 60-65 and col.3, lines 43-52: discussing the apparatus of claim 19 wherein the script routine comprises means for hiding the scrambled text from a user.

As per claim 21:

Romansky discloses a computer program product for distributing secure digital content that can be indexed by third party search engines, the computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code thereon, including:

program code for generating a text stream from the digital content by stripping all graphic information and punctuation from the digital content; **(col.2, line 5)**

program code for fragmenting the text stream into multi-word phrases; **(col.2, lines 11-32 and col.3, lines 6-17)**

program code for randomly assembling the phrases into a scrambled document; and **(col.2, lines 33-40 and col.3, lines 28-34)**

program code for making the scrambled document available to the third party search engines. **(col.3, lines 43-52)**

As per claim 22: See col.2, lines 11-35 and col.3, lines 6-17: discussing the computer program product of claim 21 wherein the program code for fragmenting the text stream comprises program code for parsing the text stream to generate a word stream and program code for fragmenting the word stream into phrases, where each phrase contains at least two words.

As per claim 23: See col.2, lines 26-40 and col.3, lines 24-35: discussing the computer program product of claim 22 wherein the total number of words in a phrase is random.

As per claim 24: See col.2, lines 11-35 and col.3, lines 12-17: discussing the computer program product of claim 23 wherein the total number of words in a phrase has a maximum of five words.

As per claim 25: See col.2, lines 26-40 and col.3, lines 24-35: discussing the computer program product of claim 21 wherein the program code for randomly assembling the phrases into a scrambled document comprises program code for forming a stream of phrases and program code for randomly swapping the position of phrases in the phrase stream.

As per claim 26: See col.1, lines 60-65 and col.3, lines 47-52: discussing the computer program product of claim 21 further comprising program code for returning the scrambled document content when the scrambled document is indexed by the third party search engines.

As per claim 27: See col.3, lines 42-52 and col.4, lines 4-10: discussing the computer program product of claim 26 wherein the program code for returning the scrambled document content comprises program code for examining a user agent parameter to determine whether a search engine or a browser is requesting the scrambled document.

As per claim 28: See col.1, lines 19-24 and 59-65: discussing the computer program product of claim 26 further comprising program code for returning a link to an owner of the secure content when a browser links from the search engine to the indexed scrambled document.

As per claim 29: See col.1, lines 19-24 and 36-65: discussing the computer program product of claim 28 wherein the scrambled document contains a script routine that loads a web page provided by the secure content owner and the program code for returning the scrambled document content comprises program code for running the script routine after the scrambled document content has been loaded into the browser.

As per claim 30: See col.1, lines 46-48 and 60-65 and col.3, lines 43-52: discussing the computer program product of claim 29 wherein the script routine comprises program code for hiding the scrambled text from a user.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEYNNA T. HA whose telephone number is (571) 272-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LHa

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100